

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 and 27-35 are pending in this Application.

By this Amendment, claim 1 is currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-12 and 27-35 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-12 and 27-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 27-31, and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0023057 (hereinafter “Goodwin”). Claims 6 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goodwin in view of non-patent literature entitled “Industries can issue digital certificates to hike security” (hereinafter “Casiraya”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-35 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Office Action alleges that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, the Office Action asserts that the specification does not support “a plurality of computers communicating with one another in order to perform the claimed invention.” Applicants respectfully disagree as FIG. 9 clearly illustrates one computer (data processing system 900) being in communication with “other computer systems” via network interface 916. Thus, FIG. 9 along reasonably conveyed to the skilled artisan the subject matter

of a plurality of computers. Additionally, being able to “forward” information as recited is further reasonably conveyed to the skilled artisan. FIG. 9 illustrates network interface 916 that “serves as an interface for receiving data from other sources and for transmitting data to other sources.” (Emphasis added)(Application: Paragraph [0069]). Thus, forwarding information is reasonably supported.

However, to expedite prosecution of the Application, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “outputting, from the data processing system, information configured to display the first graphical user interface on a display device.” Paragraph [0005] states that “interfaces are output that define the requirements.” Paragraph [0006] discloses “displaying the one or more interfaces.” Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify whether the proposed amendment is sufficient to withdraw the above rejection.

The Office Action further alleges that the specification fails to disclose more than one set of interfaces. Applicants do not agree but the Office Action acknowledges that a plurality of interfaces are disclosed. To expedite prosecution of the Application, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite a first and second graphical user interface. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify whether the proposed amendment is sufficient to withdraw the above rejection.

Finally, the Office Action alleges that the specification fails to disclose a workflow participant. Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph [0016] of the Application indicates that a graphical user interface outputs forms and workflows. As disclosed, “workflows provide information on actions that should be taken and also link to the form that receives input for the results of those actions.” It is not unreasonable to understand from the specification that the user to which a workflow is output becomes a “workflow participant.” Moreover, it is not unreasonable to understand from the specification that a user that inputs results of those actions is also a “workflow participant.” However, to expedite prosecution of the Application, Applicants have amended claim 1 removing reference to any “workflow participants.” Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify whether the proposed amendment is sufficient to withdraw the above rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-12 and 27-35 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. To expedite prosecution of the Application, Applicants have amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify whether the proposed amendment is sufficient to withdraw the above rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-35 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Goodwin.

Applicants, however, respectfully submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the evidence presented in the Office Action. As reiterated by the Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. (KSR), 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007), the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is stated in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). The factual inquiries enunciated by the Court are as follows:

- (A) Determining the scope and content of the prior art;
 - (B) Ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art;
- and
- (C) Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

To reach a proper determination under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner must step backward in time and into the shoes worn by the hypothetical “person of ordinary skill in the art” when the invention was unknown and just before it was made. In view of all factual information, the Examiner must then make a determination whether the claimed invention “as a whole” would have been obvious at that time to that person. (M.P.E.P. § 2142). “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to

have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

Applicants respectfully submit that Goodwin fails to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-35. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-35 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

The Office Action alleges on page 10 that the claimed invention is “merely providing a user with a plurality of interfaces that allow a user to input the requested information through the use of prompts.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 recites a specific improved way in which user interfaces are provided for managing stability studies. As recited in amended claim 1, one or more requirements needed for a stage of at least one stability study is determined based on information retrieved from the a database for the selected stage. As further recited, a first graphical user interface is automatically generated based on the one or more determined requirements needed for the stage. As recited, the first graphical user interface is configured to display the one or more determined requirements needed for the stage and accept input from users of the first graphical user interface for the determined one or more requirements needed for the stage.

Goodwin, however, does not disclose the automatic generation of user interfaces as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Goodwin fails to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Goodwin, and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application.

Appl. No. 10/666,403
Amdt. dated January 11, 2010
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 3689

PATENT

Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62317134 v1